

down to a passive, innocuous course in the city council that brought upon him the criticism of those who put him in office. The opponents of direct legislation cite this as an instance of the uselessness of the recall, while the advocates of the system contend that it merely demonstrates that the recall alone can not accomplish that which can be better done by a combination of the initiative, referendum and recall. The advocates of direct legislation in this connection point to another instance in the political history of Los Angeles as showing the moral effect of the recall. The instance is this: Subsequent to the recall of the alderman in question the city council, it is said, attempted to grant a street railway franchise reputed to be worth \$1,000,000 without compensation to the city. A cry was raised and a movement was started to recall several of the aldermen, whereupon the proposed franchise ordinance was withdrawn. In 1903 Los Angeles obtained also the initiative and referendum.

BEGINNING ABOUT 1892

Such is the movement for direct legislation in cities and states in this country. The agitation for it started in an effective way about 1892. After a long campaign, Iowa in 1897, led the way with a general law applying the referendum to all franchise grants. Nebraska followed the same year with a law that was designed to enable cities to introduce both the initiative and referendum. The next year South Dakota adopted a constitutional amendment for the initiative and referendum in state affairs. In 1902 Oregon adopted the system in a form that has become the pattern for other commonwealths, and then in rapid succession followed the other states. Colorado and Arkansas were the last two states to adopt the initiative and referendum, Colorado by a vote of 89,141 to 28,698, and Arkansas by a vote of 91,363 to 39,680. The proposal is now before the people of California in the shape of a constitutional amendment, providing not only for the initiative and referendum, but also for the recall applicable even to the judiciary.

Heretofore the question of direct legislation has been either a municipal or a state issue, but recent events have exalted it into practically a national question. These events center around the admission of the territory of Arizona, with its constitution containing the initiative, referendum and recall, applicable to all elective state officers. This would make the recall applicable to the judiciary, as it exists in Oregon and as it is now before the people of California. Only one state has come into the union with a constitution containing an initiative and referendum provision. That was Oklahoma, but it did not contain a recall provision. In the United States senate the fiercest opposition developed among republicans and some democrats to the Arizona constitution, because of its direct legislation feature, and more particularly because of the proposed application of the recall to all elective officers, which includes the judiciary. This opposition went to the extent that most of the republicans and one democrat, Senator Bailey of Texas, voted to keep out both Arizona and New Mexico because of the provision in the Arizona constitution, the question being upon a joint resolution to admit the two territories.

The difference between the two constitutions is interesting. New Mexico's constitutional convention was controlled by republicans, who did not insert either the initiative or the recall, but adopted a referendum to become effective on the petition "of not less than 25 per cent of the qualified electors in each judicial district of the state," a stipulation which, it is asserted, would make the referendum unworkable under existing political conditions in that territory. The Arizona constitution provides for the initiative and referendum, the initiative on application of 15 per cent of the voters, and the recall applicable to all elective officers. Other notable features of the Arizona constitution are the direct primary system, the advisory primary for United States senators, non-partisan elections for the judiciary, juvenile courts with the age of responsibility fixed at eighteen years, physical valuation of railroads, abrogation of the fellow-servant doctrine in lawsuits, corporation commission with wide powers.

The democratic position is that so long as a territory offers a republican form of government, congress should admit it to statehood, and in the present extra session of congress they will attempt to force the admission of Arizona as a state. It is the fight that will be made against such action that will probably bring the initiative, referendum and recall to the front as a

national issue, where heretofore it has existed only as a problem in local government.

This situation has produced a widespread interest in the subject of direct legislative agencies and an interesting variety of views are being expressed upon it. It is with these views, as well as the question as it is now before the supreme court of the United States, in the case from Oregon, that the next article of this series will treat.

WATCH IT GROW

Do you believe that the democratic party should be kept free from entanglements with special interests? Do you believe that its representatives should mean to redeem the spirit as well as the letter of its platform pledges?

If you believe the democratic party should be true to its name you may help win the fight to protect its national convention from the invading forces of those who would make the party the laughing stock of real democrats.

Mr. Bryan will do his part in the effort to protect the democratic party from "Aldrichism." On the stump and through The Commoner he will insist that the progress made by the party during the past sixteen years shall not be thrown away; that the special interests shall not control the convention; that its platform shall be honest and unequivocal and its candidates devoted to genuine democratic doctrine.

In order to place his views before a larger number of people Mr. Bryan has given instructions that his paper, The Commoner, be sent to every subscriber for a period of two years for the sum of \$1.00—the regular price for one year.

You are invited to join Mr. Bryan in this great fight. Every Commoner reader can aid greatly if he will secure one or more two-year subscribers at this special rate. This will carry the subscription beyond the presidential campaign.

Will you assist in this effort to prevent the Aldrichization of the democratic party?

Although the democratic party has not controlled administrations in recent years its democratic platforms have given it a power possessed by no other party in history—the power to compel opposing parties to recognize the righteousness of its platforms.

Never in all its history has the democratic party so well represented the hopes and aspirations of the progressive men of all parties as it does today.

This advantage has been won by the party's persistent fight for the people during the past sixteen years.

Today the American people are looking to the democratic party as the leader in real reforms. The people have lost confidence in the republican party. Can the democratic party be trusted?

The democratic national convention for 1912 will provide the answer.

The special interests that have wrecked the republican party are seeking to gain control of the democratic party. They hope to nominate for president a "reactionary" who will be satisfactory to the Wall Street interests.

If they find that the progressive sentiment is too strong to be entirely ignored they will take some one who has been progressive enough to furnish them something to talk about but not progressive enough to fight the interests.

The democratic party seems ready to come into its own. After a long fight the progressive policies which aroused the opposition of all the predatory interests in 1896 are becoming the accepted policies of the country, but the interests will do their best to nominate a candidate who is not in sympathy with them and who tried to retard their progress.

Following are sample letters:

Mrs. Elizabeth Compton, St. Louis, Mo: This is my second attempt in securing subscribers to your estimable paper. My first effort was two years ago, when I got seven new names. This time I have been more successful, because of the proffered assistance of five school children, who are great admirers of Mr. Bryan, namely; Watt W. Ferguson, Sidney Sternburger, Bessie Bumbarger, Isabel Lowenthal, Elizabeth Hall. With this valuable help, I am sending you the names of twenty-two new subscribers. Your paper improves with age. The principles you represent are recognized even by republicans, as those the people want. With the exception of two or three, all of these new subscribers are republicans. They include the names of physicians, clergymen, planters, cotton brokers, dentists, and many other lines of commercial life. I take pleasure in knowing that your principles of

honest government will be carried into nine states through this list of subscribers—Texas, Missouri, Iowa, Oklahoma, Illinois, New York, New Jersey, Kentucky, Tennessee. I should think the women of this great republic would rally to your assistance in this greatest of campaigns, although I have not read of any taking an active part in spreading the circulation of The Commoner. The women of the country should work for Mr. Bryan "in season and out of season," as he advocates everything that is for their well-being and happiness. He champions the cause of temperance, one of the greatest blessings to society and the family, without which there can be neither happiness nor prosperity. He advocates the cheapening of everything that enters into the household: our stockings, shoes, woolen suits and coats; sheets and blankets for our beds; and food for the table as well. Mr. Bryan's efforts in behalf of the working women are greatly appreciated by every member of our household, I assure you. May Mr. Bryan be blessed with good health, and may The Commoner reach a million households before another presidential election is the sincere wish of yours very truly.

J. D. Cox, Missouri—Enclosed find \$3.00 for three two-year subscriptions. This makes fifty subscribers I have sent in since January 1, 1911. About forty-one are new ones. Long live The Commoner that is fighting for Jeffersonian principles.

The following named Commoner readers have sent in subscribers in number as follows:

S. H. Lauder, Ia., 5; Silas Wilkinson, N. Y., 14; Jas. H. Kall, O., 6; Sam'l. P. White, Ky., 8; Fitch Raynsford, Vt., 5; Jos. H. Rowland, Okla., 6; F. E. Wilson, N. D., 7; J. S. Hartman, N. M., 11; L. C. Larsen, N. Y., 6; J. F. Lucas, Mo., 10; Peter J. Mayan, Pa., 7; Zach. Shields, Ky., 35; W. H. Lester, Okla., 6; W. E. Roberts, Okla., 6; G. T. Jenkins, Mo., 6; E. E. Anderson, Kan., 5; M. V. B. Exum, Tenn., 5; Wm. H. Horshler, W. Va., 6; J. H. Dunkel, O., 8; A. D. Morgan, Mo., 5; M. E. Shepler, Ida., 5; Curtis Sheppard, N. D., 8; Jno. Wineland, Tex., 5; Thos. D. Turner, O., 7; J. H. Allison, O., 7; E. J. Kay, Minn., 5; Fred Retterer O., 14; Thos. Conner, Ia., 5; W. H. Grant, Ill., 6; C. W. Amberg, Tex., 5; D. J. Frantz, Pa., 5; S. P. Rocjatsdon, Okla., 6; J. Q. Green, Cal., 25; S. E. Stoehr, Mo., 7; J. W. Hamilton, Tex., 13; R. H. Robinson, N. Y., 8; Thos. Wolfe, Pa., 6; Ole K. Lee, Ia., 5; J. H. Langdon, Neb., 7; M. L. Shields, Pa., 5; L. P. Watson, Mo., 6; W. R. Love, Kan., 6; J. J. Robinson, N. J., 6; W. E. Parsons, Mich., 5; M. R. Williams, Pa., 6; Jno. L. Becker, Ill., 8; Jas. De Bois, Mich., 7; G. S. Chenault, Okla., 5; J. W. Achelpohl, Kan., 8; F. A. Southworth, Wis., 5; A. C. Karrick, Ky., 5; H. Woodruff, Neb., 8; T. J. Knisley, W. Va., 8; W. G. Throckmorton, Ky., 6; H. L. Moffitt, Ia., 5; T. O. Gonderzik, Wis., 5; L. F. Dimick, Ill., 8; A. Yoder, Kan., 6; C. N. Pollock, Miss., 5; S. T. Baer, Neb., 7; H. R. Maginry, Pa., 5; J. A. Peast, Ky., 5; J. M. Worcester, Mont., 8; L. A. Sears, O., 10; Junius H. Wood, Colo., 7; Jno. J. Kuhn, Ind., 6; J. L. Teeters, Neb., 5; J. E. Kenerline, Pa., 6; A. D. Whitfield, Kan., 6; J. D. Cox, Mo., 6; F. J. Schellenberg, Pa., 6; R. M. Phelps, Cal., 12; Jno. F. Brown, Mo., 6; C. S. Rogers, Pa., 6; Moses King, Mo., 7; Thos. H. Slaven, Cal., 24; S. F. McKenrick, Ia., 8; J. K. Fridley, S. D., 6; Jas. Johnston, Ill., 9; Simon Langell, Mich., 10; G. T. Kerfoot, Kan., 6; A. V. Mounce, Ida., 6; Jno. Becker, O., 12; H. N. Jones, Kan., 6; David Lloyd, N. D., 13; Wm. Beacom, Mich., 6; E. M. Crawford, Tenn., 6; T. F. North, Kan., 6; W. M. Childs, Mo., 7; E. R. Klein, N. Y., 5; H. E. Iglar, O., 5; Wm. A. Walters, Ind., 5; E. M. Runk, N. D., 5; H. R. Swallen, O., 5; J. V. Wayman, Cal., 5; A. G. Sloan, Okla., 5; Will Young, Mo., 5; J. T. Burke, Ind., 5; J. A. Frohlich, Wis., 5; Fred Cook, O., 5; J. R. Metcalf, Mo., 5; C. E. Bender, Kan., 5; Mrs. H. L. Wilcox, Wyo., 5; H. H. Heydon, Minn., 5; W. E. Robinson, Ia., 5; J. W. Walker, Kan., 5; Geo. A. Schaefer, N. Y., 5; Frank Millart, O., 5; A. J. Scoggins, Cal., 5; Woorall Reed, O., 5; J. M. Coats, Ia., 5; A. T. Rees, Ky., 5; W. A. Page, Ill., 5; J. M. Terry, Ia., 5; F. L. Thompson, Ia., 5; C. B. Bush, W. Va., 5; Rev. R. P. Werner, O., 5; W. H. Miller, Pa., 5; E. J. Crider, Okla., 6; J. W. Brier, Cal., 5; W. C. Zerbe, Pa., 7; J. E. Lane, Ia., 5; Roy L. Randall, Mich., 5; Jno. A. Tadlock, Ore., 5; R. T. Nichols, Kan., 5; L. W. Gilson, Ia., 5; Tom Allen, Ind., 5; D. C. Moltzan, Mont., 5; Jno. Ryan, O., 8; Wm. McCreay, Ill., 5; S. F. Koontz, O., 8; W. A. S. Cobb, Tex., 10; M. E. Kane, Mich., 5; J. C. Skinner, Ia., 6; Perry G. Alfred, W. Va., 5; W. J. Whitney, Me., 6; H. H. McCann, W. Va., 5; R. A. Humpston, Tenn., 5; H. H. Hungote, Wash., 5; Samuel H. Doud, Ia., 5.